

**IN THE ABSTRACT**

Please replace the current abstract with the following new abstract with additions shown as underlined and deletions shown as strike-through:

A system, method, and business model by which literary works are posted for review on publicly accessible networks such as the internet where reader input is used to identify the works likely to succeed in the marketplace. Authors/writers submit works for electronic review. Reader demographics (where possible) and reader evaluations of works are recorded and used to rank submitted works. Top ranked works receive additional reviews until a “market significant” level is reached. All authors are provided feedback and ~~{Chris — can’t use ampersand in patent text}~~ & ranking statistics on their works. Top ranked authors are allowed to market their works using the branding of the business or publicly accessible network (*e.g.*, internet site branding). Publishers, agents, ~~& other~~ and other media representatives are provided access to top ranked authors/writers, their works, work-specific statistics ~~& overall~~ and overall market statistics. ~~This invention may be characterized as a reader-based, electronic, editorial marketplace for literary works, providing services across the publishing industry and other media industries.~~

**IN THE CLAIMS**

Please amend the claims as shown below:

1. (Currently amended) A system for providing reader-supplied evaluation of a sample of an authored work for potential publication of the work comprising:  
  
an author interface module, operably connected to the Internet, for receiving a portion of a work from an author to be reviewed via the Internet;  
  
storage means for storing the work along with other works for review;  
  
a reader interface module for receiving a request from a reader to review a work;  
  
work presentation means for presenting a portion of a work to the reader based on the reader's request;  
  
security means for implementing at least one security mechanism to limit the ability of users to plagiarize the work;  
  
a review receiving module for receiving evaluation of the work from the reader and placing the review in the storage means associated with the work; and  
  
criteria determination means for determining whether the work meets predetermined reader-satisfaction criteria.
2. (Original) The system of claim 1 further comprising analysis means for generating analysis information regarding the work based on the reader-feedback.
3. (Original) The system of claim 2 wherein the analysis indicates the percentage of readers that would purchase the work.
4. (Original) The system of claim 1 wherein the criteria determination means determines whether a predetermined number of reviews have been made prior to evaluating whether the reader-satisfaction criteria have been met.

5. (Original) The system of claim 4 wherein the criteria determination means utilizes multiple rounds of criteria and determines whether a predetermined number of reviews has been made for each round prior to evaluating whether the reader-satisfaction criteria have been met.

6. (Original) The system of claim 5 wherein the criteria determination means removes a work from availability for presentation to a reader if the work does not meet the predetermined reader-satisfaction criteria.

7. (Currently amended) The system of claim 1 ~~claim 7~~ further comprising reader-feedback means for providing reader feedback to the author ~~reader~~ if a work is rejected to enable the author ~~reader~~ to revise the work for resubmission.

8. (Original) The system of claim 5 wherein the reader-satisfaction criteria are different for each round.

9. (Original) The system of claim 8 wherein the reader-satisfaction criteria comprise a willingness to purchase and wherein the percentage of readers that find the work willing to purchase increases with each round.

10. (Original) The system of claim 4 wherein the predetermined number of reviews is based on demographics of the readers so that the criteria determination means evaluates the reader-satisfaction criteria after certain numbers of readers from each of a plurality of demographics has evaluated the work.

11. (Original) The system of claim 10 wherein the work presentation means selects a work from the storage means based on demographics of the reader and the number of readers from each demographic that the work needs to meet the demographic reader requirements.

12. (Original) The system of claim 1 wherein the work presentation means selects a work based on a genre selected by the reader.

13. (Original) The system of claim 1 further comprising a membership module that creates a membership for the author prior to work submission that includes a contract in which the member/submitter agrees to pay a percentage of royalties earned from the work when it is published.

14. (Original) The system of claim 13 wherein the membership module also collects a fee for each submission of a work for review from the member.

15. (Currently amended) A method for providing on-line evaluation of authored works for potential publication of the work comprising the steps of:

receiving a portion of a work from an author to be reviewed via an Internet communication from a remote computer system;

storing the work along with other works for review at a host computer system;

receiving a request from a reader to review a work;

presenting a portion of a work to the reader based on the reader's request electronically over a network;

implementing at least one security mechanism to limit the ability of users to plagiarize the work;

receiving evaluation of the work from the reader and placing the review in the storage means associated with the work; and

determining whether the work meets predetermined reader-satisfaction criteria.

16. (Original) The method of claim 15 further comprising the step of generating analysis information regarding the work based on the reader-feedback.

17. (Original) The method of claim 16 wherein the analysis indicates the percentage of readers that would purchase the work.
18. (Currently amended) The method of claim 16 ~~claim 4~~ wherein the criteria determination step comprises determining a predetermined number of reviews have been made prior to evaluating whether the reader-satisfaction criteria have been met.
19. (Original) The method of claim 18 wherein the criteria determination step comprises multiple rounds of criteria determination, wherein each round has a predetermined number of reviewers and a reader-satisfaction criteria.
20. (Original) The method of claim 19 further comprising the step of removing a work from availability for presentation to a reader if the work does not meet the predetermined reader-satisfaction criteria.
21. (Original) The method of claim 20 further comprising the step of providing feedback to the reader if a work is rejected to enable the reader to revise the work for resubmission.
22. (Currently amended) The method of claim 20 ~~claim 5~~ wherein the reader-satisfaction criteria are different for each round.
23. (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein the reader-satisfaction criteria comprise a willingness to purchase and wherein the percentage of readers that find the work willing to purchase increases with each round.
24. (Original) The method of claim 22 wherein the predetermined number of reviews is based on demographics of the readers so that the criteria determination means evaluates the reader-satisfaction criteria after certain numbers of readers from each of a plurality of demographics has evaluated the work.

25. (Original) The method of claim 24 further comprising the step of selecting a work to present to a reader based on demographics of the reader and the number of readers from each demographic that the work needs to meet the demographic reader requirements.

26. (Original) The method of claim 15 wherein the work presentation step involves selecting a work based on a genre selected by the reader.

27. (Original) The method of claim 15 further comprising the step of creating a membership for the author prior to work submission that includes a contract in which the member/submitter agrees to pay a percentage of royalties earned from the work when it is published.

28. (Original) The method of claim 27 further comprising the step of collecting a fee for each submission of a work for review from the member.

29. (Original) The method of claim 15 further comprising the step of assisting in publication of the work if predetermined reader-satisfaction criteria are established.

30. (Original) The method of claim 29 further comprising the step of issuing a certification of approval from a host entity.

31. (Original) The method of claim 30 further comprising the step of licensing the publisher with the right to post the certification with the work.

32. (Original) The method of claim 30 further comprising the step of licensing the author with the right to post the certification with the work.

33. (Original) The method of claim 15 further comprising the step of providing on-line publication of an entire work that meets the predetermined reader-satisfaction criteria.

34. (Original) The method of claim 33 further comprising deriving revenue from the publication of the work.

35. (Newly added) The system of claim 1 wherein the at least one security mechanism comprises providing only a portion of the work to limit access of the reader to the entirety of the work.

36. (Newly added) The method of claim 1 wherein the at least one security mechanism comprises providing only a portion of the work to limit access of the reader to the entirety of the work.

**REMARKS**

Applicant has considered the pending Office Action and references cited and have elected to amend the pending claims and submit additional new claims to more clearly describe the inventions. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended, along with a few dependent claims, for clarification. New claims 35 and 36 have been added. No new matter is added with these amendments.